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Reviewer comments

Overall, the authors have addressed the comments well. A few minor points are detailed below.

Within the discussion on page 19, it highlights specific weaknesses within the study. One weakness acknowledged by the authors is the inability to comment on adherence rates beyond surveying patients in the clinic. However, this weakness has not been commented upon within the discussion section. This should be added as an important point that potentially influences the generalisability of the study findings.

The definition of what constitutes a severe exacerbation needs to be included within the text.

On page 19, a reference to support the statement of frequent exacerbator phenotype should be included in the manuscript.

On page 19, it is stated that the algorithm may benefit bronchiectasis patients no matter their comorbidities, underlying pathology or phenotype. However, the authors have only included or made reference to tracking 2 comorbidities. In their response, they have mentioned that patients had other comorbidities, so this information should be included in the description of the patients in this study in the early section in results.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal